



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,052	11/17/2003	Rudolf Josef Moosburger	000470.00008	1134
22907 7590 01/25/2008 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			EXAMINER PATEL, SHAMBHAVI K	
			ART UNIT 2128	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,052

Applicant(s)

MOOSBURGER ET AL.

Examiner

Shambhavi Patel

Art Unit

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 September 2007 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-53 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05 September 2007, with respect to claims 1-53 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1-53 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 16, 32, 43, 47, 49 and 53:

- i. the terms "structured", "end-user" and "sufficient" are indefinite
- ii. the claims recite the limitation "to execute the steps to". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear which steps are executed to run the simulation model.

All other claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. **Claims 1-15, 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent **claims 1 and 43** are system claims, but appear to be directed solely to software. Thus, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the claimed invention may be interpreted as software per se, and would therefore lack the necessary hardware to enable any functionality to be realized. All other claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claims 1-53** would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101 set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1:

The prior art of record does not teach “computer-implemented simulation content file creation means for creating a simulation content file that includes information describing the simulation system model” and “a computer implemented simulation player.” Examiner notes that the term “simulation content file” is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 13-14 of the specification** and the term “simulation player” is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 15-16 of the specification**.

Regarding claim 16, 32, 43, 47, 49 and 53:

The prior art of record does not teach “a computer-readable simulation content file that includes information describing the simulation system model” and “a computer implemented simulation player.” Examiner notes that the term “simulation content file” is interpreted according to the definition

Application/Control Number:
10/713,052
Art Unit: 2128

Page 4

provided on **pages 13-14 of the specification** and the term “simulation player” is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 15-16 of the specification**.

All other claims are indicated as allowable by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shambhavi Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on (571) 272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SKP


KAMINI SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on **05 September 2007** has been entered.
2. Claims 1-53 have been presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05 September 2007, with respect to claims 1-53 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1-53 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1, 16, 32, 43, 47, 49 and 53:

- i. the terms "structured", "end-user" and "sufficient" are indefinite
- ii. the claims recite the limitation "to execute the steps to". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear which steps are executed to run the simulation model.

All other claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. **Claims 1-15, 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent **claims 1 and 43** are system claims, but appear to be directed solely to software. Thus, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the claimed invention may be interpreted as software per se, and would therefore lack the necessary hardware to enable any functionality to be realized. All other claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claims 1-53** would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101 set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1:

The prior art of record does not teach “computer-implemented simulation content file creation means for creating a simulation content file that includes information describing the simulation system model” and “a computer implemented simulation player.” Examiner notes that the term “simulation content file” is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 13-14 of the specification** and the term “simulation player” is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 15-16 of the specification**.

Regarding claim 16, 32, 43, 47, 49 and 53:

The prior art of record does not teach “a computer-readable simulation content file that includes information describing the simulation system model” and “a computer implemented simulation player.” Examiner notes that the term “simulation content file” is interpreted according to the definition

Application/Control Number:
10/713,052
Art Unit: 2128

Page 4

provided on **pages 13-14 of the specification** and the term "simulation player" is interpreted according to the definition provided on **pages 15-16 of the specification**.

All other claims are indicated as allowable by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shambhavi Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 am – 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on (571) 272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SKP


KAMINI SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER